UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social Council

Distr.
LIMITED

E/ICEF/1992/AB/L.16
8 April 1992

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND
Committee on Administration and Finance
1992 session

FOR ACTION

THE STRUCTURE AND FORMAT OF BUDGET DOCUMENTS: REVIEW OF THE UNICEF JOB CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

SUMMARY

The present document describes the evolution of the job classification system in UNICEF and its relationship with the standards promulgated by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC). (The Master Standard for classification of Professional posts, based on the ICSC Master Standard, is included in the annex to the present document.) It details the system from the establishment of posts, through the budget exercise, to the classification of posts through technical reviews and by job classification panels.

The document focuses on the criteria applied to the classification of D-1 and D-2 posts, both at headquarters and in field offices. It explains the various special considerations given to and proposed for classifying senior-level posts in terms of the particular needs of UNICEF.

The final chapter of the document relates the classification process to more recent developments in human resources planning within UNICEF.

92-16114 3285e (E) 090592 100592

/...

CONTENTS

	Paragraphs	Page
INTRODUCTION	1	3
I. JOB CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM IN UNICEF	2 - 15	3
A. Historical evolution of job classification	2 - 6	3
B. Job classification and the budget process	7 - 9	4
C. Current job classification procedures	10 - 15	5
II. REVIEW OF UNICEF JOB CLASSIFICATION CRITERIA APPLIED TO D-1 AND D-2 LEVEL POSTS	16 - 25	7
A. Review of criteria applied to posts at the D-1 and D-2 levels at UNICEF headquarters' locations	18 - 22	7
B. Review of criteria applied to representative posts at UNICEF field offices	23 - 25	9
III. NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN HUMAN RESOURCES PLANNING	26 - 30	9
Annex. Master Standard for classification of Professional posts		12

INTRODUCTION

1. The 1991 Executive Board, in its decision 1991/30 (E/ICEF/1991/15), requested UNICEF to review the criteria for grading staff, in particular at the D-1 and D-2 levels. The present report has been prepared in response to that request, with guidance from the Reference Group on the Structure and Format of Budget Documents.

I. JOB CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM IN UNICEF

A. Historical evolution of job classification

2. Until the late 1970s, UNICEF looked to its budget reviews to aid i financial planning and to its annual staff reviews for identifying promotable staff members. In those years, the pyramid of posts in the UNICEF budget usually reflected more of the performance and promotability of incumbents than of the demands of the office and the job. In 1979, however, a job classification system was introduced as a management tool.

3. Accordingly, job classification criteria were developed for both Professional and General Service categories, followed by a comprehensive review of all posts. The findings of that review were implemented in 1980.

4. The new classification system enabled UNICEF to determine appropriate numbers, levels and the distribution of posts based on attributes of the positions rather than on those of their incumbents.

5. It was in that same year, 1980, but after UNICEF had applied its job classification system, that the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) promulgated common classification standards for use by all United Nations organizations. Agencies were to implement the system as soon as possible, but in phases because of the sheer volume of work involved in its system-wide implementation, particularly for those agencies having to convert from their existing job classification system. UNICEF then discontinued the use of its earlier criteria and adopted the newly promulgated ICSC standards (see the annex to the present document). The transition from UNICEF standards to those of ICSC was not difficult; the factors for evaluation in the ICSC Master Standard were similar to those used by UNICEF up to that time. Since all Professional jobs at UNICEF had been classified in the same year or only one year prior to the promulgation of the ICSC standards in 1980, UNICEF applied the new standards to the review of proposals for creating new posts or upgrading existing posts. Existing posts retained their grades, except where major changes in their functions and responsibilities were anticipated. ICSC concurred with these procedures.

6. When ICSC promulgated the standards in 1980, it envisioned that the standards would consist of three tiers of classification criteria:

(a) Tier I (or Master) Standard, which is a factor-point rating system generally applicable to all jobs throughout the United Nations system. In this system, jobs are evaluated by analysing such requirements as degrees of accountability, levels of managerial responsibilities and diversity of knowledge, academic training and work experience. Such analyses result in ranges of scores into which all Professional grades fall. This standard was promulgated in 1980 when ICSC first introduced the common job classification system;

(b) Tier II Standards, intended to serve as "benchmarks", or examples for jobs at various grades in specific occupational areas. Following the promulgation of the Tier I Standard, ICSC began developing these "benchmark" job descriptions, as part of Tier II Standards, for typical occupations that are common throughout the United Nations system. ICSC promulgated such benchmark job descriptions for several occupational groups in the early 1980s, to be used along with the Master Standard. Since then, ICSC has continued to develop and promulgate benchmarks for occupations that are common throughout the United Nations system. Today, Tier II covers 13 occupational areas (approximately 80 job descriptions), and many more are being developed to be included in the standards;

(c) Tier III Standards are intended to enable individual agencies to adapt the Tier II Standards to their particular needs and structures, thereby developing their own benchmarks for specific existing occupational groups. Similar to the Tier II Standards, these benchmarks would describe typical job attributes and duties representing specific grade levels in certain occupational groups and would be used to analyse and grade jobs in those groups. These benchmarks, once developed and perfected, must be submitted to ICSC to ensure that they are comparable to the common system grade-level standards. If they are seen as meeting ICSC Tiers I or II Standards, they are then promulgated by ICSC. No agency has yet requested ICSC to promulgate any Tier III Standards.

B. Job classification and the budget process

7. Job classification is an integral part of the budget planning and review process in UNICEF. As a result, posts are classified in relation to the planning period of the biennium budgets. During the period when the biennium budgets are prepared, the Budget Planning and Review Committee examines and expresses its opinion on proposals for creating or upgrading posts. Those posts that the Committee agrees to recommend for inclusion in the budget proposals are then reviewed against the Tier I and Tier II Standards (in cases where benchmarks already exist) to determine the appropriateness of the proposed grade levels. With the endorsement of the Executive Director, the proposed classified levels are then included in the budget proposals for review by the Executive Board. Quarterly budget reviews are conducted to accommodate the establishment of additional project posts required by field offices in support of country programmes. The same process takes place for the classification of such new posts.

/

8. During the past few years, a proper classification of D-1 and D-2 posts, other than representative posts, has not taken place, even though the classification process for other grades has been refined. This refinement has led to considerable improvement and enhanced objectivity; in the past, a number of job classification panel proposals were not approved by the Executive Director. In the 1992-1993 biennium, however, he endorsed all but one. The classification of D-1 and D-2 posts is addressed in detail in the present paper.

9. No upgradings are allowed between biennium budget periods. Moreover, UNICEF regards all upgraded posts as new posts. After classification, they are advertised in the internal vacancy bulletins. The incumbents of the upgraded posts are eligible to apply for such posts, as are all staff members throughout the organization. These posts may also be advertised externally if it is clear that only very few internal candidates qualify. In the 1990-1991 biennium, 164 Professional posts were upgraded, and incumbents of 76 were promoted in the new posts. In the event that the incumbent of the old post is not appointed to the new post, the organization makes every reasonable effort to place the incumbent in another suitable post in accordance with established UNICEF policy. Similarly, a post that reports to an upgraded post is not automatically upgraded. The upgrading of such posts is proposed when their responsibilities grow and job requirements become more complex. The proposals are then reviewed by the Budget Planning and Review Committee and, if endorsed, they are classified by the job classification panel.

C. Current job classification procedures

10. As soon as the Budget Planning and Review Committee completes its deliberations on proposals from field offices or work units at headquarters for the creation or upgrading of posts, the Budget Section sends the Committee's recommendations on those proposals to the Remuneration Unit, which, by then, should have received job descriptions of proposed posts and other information from the proposing offices. Any proposal submitted to the Committee for creating or upgrading posts must be accompanied by written justifications and fully developed job descriptions.

11. Since 1984, UNICEF has used a two-pronged approach in classifying all Professional officer posts from levels 1 to 5 and General Service posts. It includes a "technical review", conducted by classification specialists, and a "panel review", whereby consensus is reached by a slate of peer staff members. All new posts are subject to technical review; proposals for upgrading are reviewed by the job classification panel. The panel is also exclusively responsible for (a) reclassification from the General Service category to the Professional category; and (b) recourse requests for technically graded posts.

12. The classification panel approach reflects the desire of UNICEF to preserve the tradition of management-staff consultations, at the same time benefiting from the available technical knowledge and experience in each relevant specialty. The panel's normal complement of 12 staff members is appointed by the Executive Director from among nominations submitted by division heads, the Global Staff Association and the Division of Personnel. The Remuneration Unit in the Division of Personnel provides the panel with technical training, guidance and direction in the use and application of the classification standards.

13. Both the "technical" and "panel" reviews are conducted with the ICSC Tier I Master Standard, and they use a standardized scoring worksheet for each post, arriving at the appropriate range of scores for determining the grade level. In cases where a benchmark is available from the Tier II Standards, it is also used to examine or validate the scoring results.

14. Of equal importance in the review of any job is the nature of the particular organizational structure surrounding it. When a job is reviewed, not only the job description is analysed against the classification criteria, so is the relevant office organization chart. This is done in order (a) to understand the post's placement in its work environment; (b) to become familiar with the workload distribution of posts; and (c) to determine the effect of the post's responsibility and role compared with other posts in that office. To clarify the accountability of posts within an office, it is often necessary to review job descriptions of posts that are related to the primary post being reviewed. It is also customary for the remuneration officers to gather additional information about such posts from appropriate staff members or from the offices proposing the grading of the post.

15. It is noteworthy that all posts were classified via the panel review before 1983. By then, the large number of posts to be reviewed in conjunction with the biennium budget process made it necessary to find ways to expedite the classification process. After intensive in-house consultations, the job classification panel proposed that it would no longer review all posts requiring classification, but only those for which no clear precedent had already been established by the panel. Consequently, a revised procedure was instituted in 1984, enabling the remuneration specialists of the Division of Personnel to classify posts without panel review, via a "technical review". Most new posts fell into that category, requiring only "technical review" for grading. The job classification panel was to be informed periodically of the results of such reviews by the Remuneration Unit.

II. REVIEW OF UNICEF JOB CLASSIFICATION CRITERIA APPLIED TO D-1 AND D-2 LEVEL POSTS

16. The Senior Staff Review Committee is the decision-making body for senior staff appointments and promotions. It is also the forum that considers possibilities for creating or upgrading both representative posts (P-5 to D-2) and senior posts at the D-1 and D-2 levels at headquarters' locations. The Committee is chaired by the Executive Director. The three Deputy Executive Directors and the Directors of the Programme Division and the Division of Personnel are members, with the Deputy Director of the Division of Personnel serving as secretary. The six regional directors are alternate members of the group, and they join the Committee meetings if they are visiting New York and during the biannual regional directors' meetings.

17. The Senior Staff Review Committee deliberates on needs of new posts or upgrading of existing posts when special job requirements emerge from newly identified programme areas or particular operational mechanisms that must be strengthened. These new requirements are often created by future global and/or country-specific trends and developments as perceived by the Executive Director and/or as directed by the Executive Board. The Director of the Division of Personnel advises the Committee on desirable grade levels for those proposed senior positions, at both headquarters and field duty stations, using various job classification indicators derived from the ICSC Tier I Master Standard. (Posts that had been graded at the D-1 and D-2 levels before the 1980 promulgation of the ICSC Master Standard stayed at their levels because they were reviewed and classified in 1979 and 1980.)

A. Review of criteria applied to posts at the D-1 and D-2 levels at UNICEF headquarters' locations

18. At UNICEF headquarters, D-1 and D-2 posts demand of their incumbents a level of qualifications second only to that of the Executive Director and his deputies and, as such, the most important areas of their responsibility, measurable against the ICSC Tier I Master Standard, can be described as follows:

(a) Accountability for UNICEF progress towards achievement of major external and internal goals. Posts at the D-1 and D-2 levels have the most direct responsibility for the consequences of UNICEF activities in support of relevant national programmes, in cooperation with other organizations, and in the conduct of non-programme operations;

(b) Authority to develop, independently, UNICEF goals, policies, new approaches, strategies, operational and administrative systems and procedures, and to negotiate with governmental and non-governmental institutions;

(c) Managerial responsibility as measured by the scope and complexity of the job environment; degree of professional knowledge required; type and extent of work relations, both inside and outside the organization; demand for overseeing and evaluating overall effectiveness of performance in the area of responsibility; monitoring achievement of stated goals and objectives; control of optimum, timely and appropriate utilization of financial resources; safeguarding organizational, human and fixed assets; and degree of required leadership, direction, guidance and motivation of staff.

19. A division or an office at headquarters typically comprises a number of functionally specialized units that collectively administer or control a large proportion of the organization's financial resources. It may plan and implement far-reaching innovations in global policies, processes or strategies that affect country cooperative programmes. Typically, D-1 and D-2 grades are assigned to posts that head such divisions or offices requiring the levels of accountability, authority and managerial responsibility described above. D-1 and D-2 posts are normally distributed in the following patterns:

(a) D-2 level: head of a division with a group of 10 or more Professional-level posts with critically important functions, or head of a group of 3 to 6 Professional posts charged with the authority to develop and design UNICEF strategies;

(b) D-1 level: deputy to a division director, or head of a section with three to six Professional staff responsible for sectoral and/or geographical advisory services.

20. Thirty-four of a total of 55 posts at the D-1 and D-2 levels at headquarters' locations are posts of division director, deputy division director or section chief. In preparing the present report, examples of typical D-1 and D-2 posts were examined, using the ICSC Tier I Master Standard. The results demonstrate that those sampled meet the criteria in all of the major determining factors of the levels assigned to them.

21. There are some D-1 and D-2 posts heading work units that are small and intended to concentrate, primarily and full-time, on developing new and forward-looking policies and strategies, with secondary emphasis on administration.

22. Some senior advisory posts are graded at L-6 and L-7, equivalent to D-1 and D-2 levels. These posts carry duties related directly to organizational goals and strategies, planning and evaluation of UNICEF technical cooperation activities, fund-raising and advocacy. They play critical roles in strengthening and integrating headquarters' support for UNICEF field offices. These posts are also responsible for the coordination of policy and guidance with the Executive Board, and for policy and fund-raising, as well as representing UNICEF before international organizations, various bodies of the United Nations system, non-governmental organizations and the mass media. For classification purposes, they are treated in the same manner as D-1 and D-2 posts.

B. Review of criteria applied to representative posts at UNICEF field offices

23. UNICEF uses the standard classification criteria (ICSC Tier I Master Standard) as a basis for the classification of UNICEF representative posts. As described in the revised budget estimates for the biennium 1990-1991 and budget estimates for the biennium 1992-1993 (E/ICEF/1991/AB/L.1 and Add.1), submitted to and endorsed by the Executive Board at its 1991 session, additional criteria are used in determining grade levels for the posts of UNICEF representatives. They are: (a) total programme expenditure in the given country; (b) total number of Professional staff supervised; and (c) level of operating costs in the administrative budget.

24. Using the above indicators, a recently developed computer model arrived at recommended grade levels for the heads of country offices. The model was then used to set grade levels of representatives for possible inclusion in the 1992-1993 biennial budget.

25. As mentioned above, other factors that are indicators of the ICSC Tier I Master Standard are analysed and taken into consideration, in addition to those statistical analyses, in finally assigning grade levels to representative posts. Similar to senior posts at headquarters' locations, the posts of UNICEF representative exercise managerial authority at a relatively high level and are accountable to the Executive Director and his deputies in various programme, external relations and operational areas of responsibility. These field posts exist in the organization's decentralized managerial environs in which they are expected to function with maximum independence within the framework of existing operational policies and guidelines. In recent years, as UNICEF and partner Governments became engaged increasingly in time-bound and goal-oriented programmes of cooperation (e.g., primary health care, universal child immunization and other Summit goals), the job requirements of representative have become more complex. Among other responsibilities, UNICEF representatives must maintain a dialogue with the highest authorities in advocacy for children and women, while at the same time promoting policy development and supporting action programmes to assist the partner Governments in developing, implementing and monitoring progress of short- and long-term national action plans to attain Summit goals.

III. NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN HUMAN RESOURCES PLANNING

26. Today, after the first decade of using the job classification system, every post in UNICEF has an individual job description. That process made it clear that the duties of many jobs fell into recognizable patterns, regardless of where they happened to be around the world. It is now possible, therefore, to envision and develop composite, or standard, versions of such families of jobs.

27. In late 1990, UNICEF began developing generic Professional job descriptions for major occupational areas, containing core standard functions at each grade level. Drafts were completed for 45 posts covering the following occupational areas: programme management; external relations; administration/finance/personnel; health; water supply and sanitation; education; and supply operations. (A wide selection of experienced staff at headquarters and in field offices contributed extensively to those drafts through seminars and/or by actually writing them.) In January 1992, a special job classification panel met to classify them using the ICSC Tiers I and II Standards.

28. Generic job descriptions for posts of UNICEF representative and assistant representative have also been developed from P-4 to D-2 levels. These generic job descriptions will take into consideration all the factors of the Tier I Master Classification Standard as well as the elements that are utilized in determining the grade levels of representative posts as outlined in paragraph 23 above. Further work in the development of job descriptions is planned to cover most of the common key fields of UNICEF work. It is intended that such generic job descriptions will become an integral part of the job classification process and that they will be referred to in the evaluation of posts. They will also provide examples of the organization's standards of work at each grade level. After sufficient experience is gained in the use of these generic job descriptions, ICSC will be requested to promulgate them as UNICEF Tier III benchmark standards. UNICEF will keep ICSC informed of the progress made in the course of developing and using these generic job descriptions, and will seek close cooperation with and guidance from ICSC in finalizing them as benchmarks.

29. In addition to the Common Classification of Occupational Group codes which remain as the UNICEF post coding system, a coding system that identifies posts in terms of the organization's particular occupational groups is being developed as another element of human resources planning and to improve the job classification system. UNICEF is also examining possible alternative office structures to arrive at optimum compatibility between job descriptions and their work environments.

30. As part of such efforts in human resources planning and development, headquarters posts at the D-1 and D-2 levels will soon be reviewed against ICSC standards. The intention is to standardize the job descriptions as much as possible in line with the strategy applied to other Professional and General Service posts. It is proposed that a job classification panel be constituted, with senior staff as members, to provide the Executive Director with the views of peer groups on the senior posts, in addition to technical analyses presented by the Division of Personnel, thereby facilitating the Committee's determination of grades. This proposed job description panel (which may be called the Senior Job Classification Panel) will use both ICSC Tiers I and II Standards for their review. It may sometimes be necessary for the panel to consider, in its analyses of attributes of posts, factors unique only to UNICEF that may influence the consistent application of ICSC standards. While further reviews throughout the organization are expected in

the near future, UNICEF will consult ICSC for its technical input with a view to developing generic or benchmark job descriptions for this particular group of senior posts. That exercise may then lead, in future, to the promulgation of UNICEF Tier III senior post benchmarks by ICSC.

Annex

MASTER STANDARD FOR CLASSIFICATION OF PROFESSIONAL POSTS

INTRODUCTION

UNICEF had adopted the ICSC Master Standard for classification of its Professional posts. The Master Standard is a point factor classification method based on six factors. Using the Master Standard, the posts are analysed in terms of the six factors and point values are assigned for these. A total point rating for a particular post falls within a point range which indicates the appropriate grade level of the post.

This booklet contains the point schedules of the six factors and is a working tool for the Remuneration Unit and the Classification Panel for Professional posts.

In determining whether a post conforms to Professional standards, please refer to the following definition:

> "Professional work is analytical, evaluative, conceptual, interpretive and/or creative and thus requires the application of basic principles of an organized body of theoretical knowledge, such as a field of science, learning or specialized discipline. It is intricate and involves a level of difficulty and complexity requiring the identification and consideration not only of the interrelationships between its constituent elements, which are of a varied and diverse nature, but also the broader context and perspective within which it is performed, including its impact on, and interrelationships with, the larger objectives and programmes of the organization. It requires judgement in analysing and evaluating problems and in decision-making involving discretionary choices between alternative courses of action."

FACTOR: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE REQUIRED

This factor measures the theoretical knowledge and practical experience in applying that knowledge required by the job.

Practical experience required \ Theoretical knowledge required	1. Knowledge at first university degree or its equivalent in training and self-study.	2. Knowledge at advanced university degree level or its equivalent in training and self-study.	3. Knowledge at highest university degree level or its equivalent in training and self-study.
A. Experience in applying theoretical knowledge at national level for up to one year.	100 150 200	200 250 300	300 350 400
B. Experience in applying theoretical knowledge at national level from one up to five years; OR at international level for up to two years.	150 200 250	250 300 350	350 400 450
C. Experience in applying theoretical knowledge at national level for over five up to ten years; OR at international level for over two up to five years.	200 250 300	300 350 400	400 450 500
D. Both of the above.	250 300 350	350 400 450	450 500 550
E. Experience in applying theoretical knowledge at national level for over 10 years; OR at international level for over five up to ten years.	300 350 400	400 450 500	500 550 600
F. Both of the above.	350 400 450	450 500 550	550 600 650
G. Experience in applying theoretical knowledge at international level for over ten years.	400 450 500	500 550 600	600 650 700
Language knowledge required	The job requires that the incumbent have proficiency in one language. (0 points)	The job requires that the incumbent have proficiency in two languages. (+50 points)	The job requires that the incumbent have proficiency in three or more languages. (+100 points)

Note: This is the only three dimensional factor. In applying this factor the appropriate level of theoretical knowledge required by the job (i.e., the horizontal element) is identified first. Then the requirements of the job in terms of the level of practical experience in having applied that theoretical knowledge (i.e., the vertical element) are determined. The appropriate box that corresponds to the two elements identified is found. Finally, depending upon the language knowledge requirements of the job (i.e., the third dimension), the appropriate point value is chosen from among the three values indicated in that box. If proficiency in one language is required then the lowest score is allocated. The middle score is given for the requirement of proficiency in two languages and the highest score for the requirement of proficiency in three languages.

FACTOR: DIFFICULTY OF WORK

This factor measures the mental demands of the job in terms of complexity of the work and the degree of individual contribution required.

Complexity of assigned work \ Individual contribution	4. Essentially the synthesis, conversion and presentation of data requiring the application of the basic principles of the profession.	5. Analysing data, identifying problems, drawing conclusions and making recommendations; OR interpreting rules, procedures of tests; OR language interpretation or translation.	6. Same as 5 plus either endorsing recommendations or taking corrective or adaptive action; OR revising work at level 5.	7. Developing new approaches, procedures, techniques or terminology as an appreciable part of work; OR planning, integrating and coordinating work of predominantly level 6 positions.	8. As a major part of the work, developing new concepts, theories or policies in the solution of delicate or significant problems; OR launching major activities in new fields; OR planning, coordinating and directing work of predominantly level 6 or above positions in diverse organizational entities.	9. Planning, coordinating and directing a vital area of the Organization's work characterized by a significant number of level 8 top positions; OR planning, coordinating and directing total performance of several diverse organizational entities spanning a broad segment of the Organization's work.
H. Moderately intricate although restricted in scope and depth of treatment of subject matter.	140	220	300	385	470	560
I. Intricate with interrelationships within the subject matter not clearly evident. Either broad in scope but restricted in depth of treatment of subject matter OR restricted in scope but requiring considerable depth of treatment.	200	280	360	445	530	620
J. Substantial intricacy of subject matter. Either broad in scope but restricted in depth of treatment of subject matter OR restricted in scope but requiring considerable depth of treatment. Problems are difficult to solve.	260	340	420	505	590	680
K. Substantial intricacy of subject matter. Broad in scope and requiring considerable depth of treatment of subject matter. Problems difficult to define and complex considerations involved in solving them.	320	400	480	565	650	740
L. Involves great intricacy of subject matter and requires that several diverse phases are pursued concurrently. Extremely broad in scope and requiring considerable depth of treatment of subject matter. Problems very difficult to define and highly complex considerations (such as the impact of alternative possible solutions on other major areas of work or other organizations) involved in solving them.	380	460	540	625	710	800

FACTOR: INDEPENDENCE OF WORK

This factor measures the degree to which guidelines apply to the work and the amount of supervisory assistance and control given.

Application of guidelines / Supervisory controls over Incumbent	10. Procedures for doing the work have been standardized and a number of specific applicable guidelines are available.	11. Procedures for doing the work may not be standardized and specific applicable guidelines are not always available	12. Guidelines are only partially relevant. Incumbent occasionally required to interpret and adapt guidelines in dealing with unusual or complex situations.	13. Guidelines are only partially relevant. Work normally requires that incumbent interpret and adapt guidelines. Incumbent may establish guidelines.	14. Guidelines are broadly stated and normally require extensive interpretation. Significant departures from guidelines normally required for majority of work. Incumbent has authority to establish important guidelines.	15. Guidelines are only stated in the broadest policy terms and in terms of the over-all mission of the Organization. Incumbent has authority to establish guidelines of major importance.
M. Specific instructions are provided. Work regularly checked in process and end product reviewed for adherence to instructions, soundness of conclusions and accuracy.	110	160	210	260	310	360
N. Purpose and desired results indicated and anticipated problems discussed beforehand. Other problems that arise are discussed with supervisor. Specific instructions are provided for new assignments and the approach is normally defined by the supervisor. Work in progress periodically reviewed. End product reviewed by soundness of conclusions and accuracy.	170	220	270	320	370	420
O. Purpose and desired results indicated. The approach is normally developed jointly between incumbent and supervisor. Problems that occur are discussed at discretion of official. Work in process reviewed at discretion of supervisor. End product reviewed for soundness of conclusions and judgement	230	280	330	380	430	480
P. General objectives and boundaries indicated. Incumbent develops approach to follow which may be reviewed beforehand by supervisor. Work in process is reviewed with supervisor only when incumbent feels it is necessary. End product reviewed for attainment of objectives.	310	360	410	460	510	560
Q. General objectives and desired results are discussed between supervisor and incumbent. Results are reviewed for attainment of objectives.	380	430	480	530	580	630
R. Incumbent identifies objectives, determines desired results and communicates these to supervisor. Work considered as authoritative and normally accepted without change.	450	500	550	600	650	700

FACTOR: WORK RELATIONSHIPS

This factor measures the skill required in work relationships and the importance of contacts to the Organization's programmes.

Importance \ Skill	16. To give, obtain and exchange information requiring discussion and explanation.	17. To persuade and obtain assistance of others on matters of non-routine significance.	18. To act as adviser or representative of the Organization with authority to discuss problems and to seek: common grounds on which to recommend solutions based on predetermined guidelines provided by higher authority.	19. To act as adviser or representative of the Organization with authority to discuss problems, seek common grounds for solutions and either provide authoritative advice or commit the Organization on policy issues of limited significance.	20. To act as adviser or representative of the Organization with authority to discuss problems, seek common grounds for solutions and either provide authoritative advice or commit the Organization on policy issues of considerable significance.	21. To act as prime adviser to the executive head on policy issues of the highest significance or to act as personal representative of the executive head with mandate to make or obtain major commitments on policy issues of the highest significance to the Organization.
Inside the Organization						
1. Contacts predominantly, within same functional area.	70	110	150	190	230	255
2. Contacts predominantly within same functional area and with units outside the duty station OR outside functional area extensively throughout Organization, but generally not with units outside the duty station.	105	145	185	225	265	290
3. Both of the above.	140	180	220	260	300	325
Outside the Organization						
1. Virtually no contacts outside the Organization.	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Contacts predominantly with persons on routine subject matters	115	155	195	235	275	300
3. Contacts predominantly with persons on subject matters of importance to Organization's programmes (e.g. counterparts in other organizations or at working level in national Governments).	190	230	270	310	350	375
4. Contacts predominantly with persons on subject matters of greater importance to Organization's programmes (e.g. heads of important organizational units in other organizations or in national Governments).	265	305	345	385	425	450
5. Contacts predominantly with persons on subject matters having a significant impact on Organization's programmes (e.g. members of Organization's legislative bodies, executive heads of other organizations, heads of delegations and Ministers in national Governments).	340	380	420	460	500	525

Note: This factor is scored differently from the others. First the skill and the importance of the inside contacts required by the job are evaluated and a point value is allocated. Then the same is done for outside contacts - if any are required. Finally, the two point scores are added together to obtain the total point value for the factor.

/...

FACTOR: SUPERVISORY RESPONSIBILITY

This factor measures the management responsibility of the job in terms of the numbers of staff supervised.

Responsibility for support staff / Responsibility for Professional staff	22 0 or 1 support staff	23 2 - 10 support staff	24 11 - 25 support staff	25 26 - 50 support staff	26 51 - 100 support staff	27 101- 200 support staff	28 201 - 500 support staff	29 over 500 support staff
U. 0	0	20	40	60	80	100	125	150
V. 1 - 2 Professional staff	20	40	60	80	100	120	145	170
W. 4 - 8 Professional staff	40	60	80	100	120	140	165	190
X. 9 - 20 Professional staff	60	80	100	120	140	160	185	210
Y. 21 - 40 Professional staff	80	100	120	140	160	180	205	230
Z. 41 - 70 Professional staff	100	120	140	160	180	200	225	250
A. 71 - 100 Professional staff	125	145	165	185	205	225	250	275
B. Over 100 Professional staff	150	170	190	210	230	250	275	300

FACTOR: IMPACT OF WORK

This factor measures the importance of decisions and proposals on the Organization's objectives and the consequences of errors of such objectives.

Effect on work / Consequences of errors	30. Decisions are rarely, if ever, taken. Proposals, if accepted, affect the work of the immediate organizational unit.	31. Decisions taken are limited to methods of work or individual cases. Proposals, if accepted, directly affect the accuracy, reliability and acceptability of further processes or services.	32. Decisions taken directly affect the accuracy, reliability and acceptability of further processes or services. Proposals, if accepted, directly affect the design or operation of systems, programmes or equipment.	33. Decisions taken directly affect the design or operation of systems, programmes or equipment. Proposals, if accepted, directly affect the design or operation of major systems, programmes or equipment.	34. Decisions taken directly affect the design or operation of major systems, programmes or equipment. Proposals, if accepted, directly affect a wide range of the Organization's activities, other organizations, national Governments or the well-being of large numbers of people.	35. Decisions taken directly affect a wide range of the Organization's activities. Proposals, if accepted, have a direct and substantial effect on other organizations, national Governments or the well-being of large numbers of people.	36. Decisions taken have a direct and substantial effect on a wide range of the Organization's activities. Proposals, if accepted, substantially influence the over-all future direction of the Organization and have a direct and substantial effect on other organizations, national Governments and the well-being of large numbers of people.
c. Errors normally would cause damage only to incumbent and loss of time to immediate organizational unit.	90	140	195	250	310	370	440
d. Errors normally would cause damage to the objectives of the immediate organizational unit in terms of time, quality of money.	130	180	235	290	350	410	480
e. Errors normally would cause some damage to Organization's programmes in terms of time, quality or money.	170	220	275	330	390	450	520
f. Errors normally would cause significant damage to Organization's programmes in terms of time, quality or money and some damage to Organization's commitments to constituents.	210	260	315	370	430	490	560
g. Errors would cause significant damage to Organization's major objectives and commitments to constituents.	250	300	355	410	470	530	600

CLASSIFICATION LEVELS

The point ranges for grade levels P-1 to Under-Secretary-General (USG) are as follows:

Point ranges	Grade level
800- 969	P-1
970-1 319	P-2
1 320-1 669	P-3
1 670-2 039	P-4
2 040-2 479	P-5
2 480-2 939	D-1
2 940-3 339	D-2
3 340-3 679	ASG
3 680-3 799	USG